DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 807 TM 850 302

AUTHOR	Proller, Norman L.
TITLE	Evaluation of the 1983-84 ECIA, Chapter II Center for Urban/Minority Education Project.
INSTITUTION	Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE	Nov 84
NOTE	60p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Measures; *Disadvantaged Schools; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Environment; *Education Service Centers; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Inner City; *Inservice Teacher Education; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Workshops; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Center for Urban Minority Education; *Dade County Public Schools FL; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2

ABSTRACT

The 1983-84 Center for Urban/Minority Education (CUME) Project, funded by the Education Consolidation Improvement Act, (ECIA) Chapter II, was designed to address the needs of teachers, administrators, and parents of schools serving low-income/minority students in Dade County, Florida. However, the substantial reduction in funding from the amount originally requested required the elimination of several proposed programs and services that addressed problems of fragmentation and risk teacher attrition. The amended proposal focused project efforts primarily on professional preparation for inner-city teachers and the development of school-based organzational structures. Using data from CUME Educational Specialists' activity logs and questionnaires from inservice workshop participants, this evaluation found the 1983-84 CUME Project in compliance with the amended proposal. In spite of the positive findings the CUME Project, reduced in funding and consequently scope, was unable to strongly impact inner-city school problems. Consequently, it was recommended that: (1) CUME be eliminated unless there is sufficient funding to address problems of fragmentation and high teacher attribution; or (2) major problems be addressed at only two or three inner-city schools during the 1984-85 school year. Appendices contain supporting documentation, the activity log form, the prinicipal questionnaire, evaluation forms, and the workshop schedule. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY

Mr. Paul Cejas, Chairman
Mr. Robert Renick, Vice-Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Dr. Michael Krop
Dr. Kathleen Magrath
Ms. Janet McAliley
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

EVALUATION OF THE 1983-84

ECIA, CHAPTER II

CENTER FOR URBAN/MINORITY EDUCATION PROJECT

Principal Evaluator/Author: Norman L. Proller, Ph.D.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
NOVEMBER, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Description of the Project	3
Description of the Evaluation	3
Project staff activities	5
Perception by school-level co-participants of project personnel services	5
Evaluation of CUME-sponsored workshops	5
Participants' actual utilization and perceived effectiveness of approaches to problems suggested during the workshops	5
Results	5
Appraisal of project activity logs	5
Perception by school-level co-participants of project personnel services	6
Evaluation of CUME-sponsored workshops	6
Participants' reactions to CUME-sponsored workshops	6
Workshop participants' actual utilization of approaches to problems offered during the training sessions and the perceived effectiveness of these potential solutions.	9
Conclusions and Recommendations	23

Appendix A - Documentation Descriptive of Project Modifications

Appendix B - Activity Log

Appendix C - Principal Questionnaire

Appendix D - Workshop Evaluation Forms

Appendix E - Follow-up Evaluation Form

Appendix F - Workshop Schedule

Executive Summary

The 1983-84 Center for Urban/Minority Education (CUME) Project was funded under ECIA, Chapter II, in the amount of $100,998. It was designed to address the unique needs of teachers, administrators and parents involved with schools serving primarily low-income/minority students. CUME's initial 1983-84 proposal stipulated that the project would focus on "efficient and effective use of human and material resources to be used in a collaborative structure of joint problem solving to promote a positive school climate in inner city schools," and requested approximately $250,000 to accomplish these tasks. Following the substantial reduction in funding (from that originally requested), the Project Director amended CUME's original proposal by deleting some of its 1983-84 goals. As a result of these deletions, CUME's focus remained unchanged, but several of the structures CUME proposed to achieve its goals were dropped. More specifically, CUME eliminated the establishment of a Project Advisory Council and a parent-community network. Additionally, the collaboration with the North Central Area's administrative staff, the Intergroup Relations Team and the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center in the proposed New Teacher Immersion Program designed to impact and address teacher attrition in the inner city schools did not materialize.

In short, for a number of reasons, the 1983-84 CUME Project did not concern itself with two (out of its initial four) areas of concern to the extent originally intended: namely fragmentation and high teacher attrition. Rather, the project focused its efforts primarily on professional preparation for inner-city teachers and, to a lesser extent, on the development of school-based organizational structures.

In summary, the 1983-84 CUME Project remained in compliance with its amended proposal throughout the school year. More specifically, a review of the CUME Educational Specialists' activity logs indicated that both spent between 75 and 95 percent of their time involved with activities designed to address problems defined during CUME's 1982-83 operation. Furthermore, analysis of responses to questionnaires showed that the workshops facilitated by the project staff were well performed and appropriate, given the nature of the problems. Finally, an examination of replies to a questionnaire distributed near the end of the 1983-84 school year suggested that approaches to problems offered during the various workshops were actually applied and perceived as effective by a large majority of the inservice participants.

In spite of these positive findings, however, it appears that the CUME Project, as reduced in funding and consequently scope, was unable to strongly impact inner-city school problems. In short, the relatively restricted efforts CUME employed to deal with inner-city school problems appeared to be substantially diluted due to the pervasive extent of difficulties encapsulated in most of the inner-city schools.

As a result of these findings the following recommendation is made:

CUME should be eliminated unless the project is sufficiently well supported to address other problems characteristic of inner-city schools, namely fragmentation and high teacher attrition. The efforts which CUME offered to develop inner-city school projects during the 1983-84 school year were certainly appropriate and relevant. The impact of these efforts within the participating schools, however, was probably minimal, compared to the vast range of problems which the inner-city schools are experiencing. An alternative to more fully supporting the project would include targeting only two or three of Dade's inner-city schools and addressing most, if not all, of the major problems in these schools during the 1984-85 school year.

Description of the Project

The 1983-84 Center for Urban/Minority Education (CUME) Project was funded under ECIA, Chapter II, in the amount of $100,998. It was designed to address the unique needs of teachers, administrators and parents involved with schools serving primarily low-income/minority students. (See Table I for a list of schools participating in the 1983-84 CUME Project.) CUME's initial 1983-84 proposal stipulated that the project would focus on "efficient and effective use of human and material resources to be used in a collaborative structure of joint problem solving to promote a positive school climate in inner city schools," and requested approximately $250,000 to accomplish these tasks. Following a substantial reduction in budget (from that originally requested) the Project Director amended CUME's original proposal by deleting some of its 1983-84 goals (see Appendix A for copies of documentation describing these events). As a result of these deletions, CUME's focus remained unchanged, but several of the structures CUME proposed to achieve its goals were dropped. More specifically, CUME eliminated the establishment of a Project Advisory Council and a parent-community network. It also eliminated the collaborative relationship which it planned to establish among the North Central Area's administrative staff, the DCPS Intergroup Relations Team, and the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) to help facilitate the proposed New Teacher Immersion Program--a program designed to impact and address teacher attrition in Dade's inner city schools. Since the new Teacher Immersion Program never materialized, the intended collaboration could not be realized.

In short, because of funding restrictions, the 1983-84 CUME Project did not concern itself with two (out of its initial four) areas of concern: namely fragmentation and high teacher attrition. Rather, the project focused its efforts primarily on professional preparation for inner-city teachers and to a lesser extent the development of school-based organizational structures.

Description of the Evaluation

This evaluation was based on information that was gathered solely for this appraisal. Methods/sources utilized to collect this data included activity logs, questionnaires, interviews and workshop observations.

The 1983-84 CUME Project evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. What activities did the project staff undertake in response to problems defined during the 1982-83 operation of the CUME Project?

2. To what extent were the services of project personnel in problem definition, as well as in the definition of ameliorative approaches to problems, favorably received in this process by school-level co-participants?

3. To what extent were the inservice presentations (facilitated by project staff) evaluated as well performed and appropriate given the nature of the problems addressed?

Table I

Schools Participating in the CUME Project

Elementary Schools:	Allapattah Elementary School
	Comstock Elementary School
	Earlington Heights Elementary School
	Flamingo Elementary School
	Holmes Elementary School
	Lakeview Elementary School
	Lillie C. Evans Elementary School
	Lorah Park Elementary School
	Nathan B. Young Elementary School
	Olinda Elementary School
	Orchard Villa Elementary School
	Poinciana Park Elementary School
	Santa Clara Elementary School
	Shadowlawn Elementary School
	South Hialeah Elementary
Junior & Senior High Schools:	Allapattah Junior High School
	Miami Springs Senior High School

4. To what extent were approaches to problems suggested in these presentations actually applied and perceived as effective by participants?

Project Staff Activities

To determine the kinds of activities which the CUME staff undertook in response to problems defined during CUME's 1982-83 operations, a review was made of the Project's activity logs. More specifically, the logs maintained by each of the project's educational specialists were examined to ascertain the extent to which their respective activities helped facilitate the development and implementation of workshops based on CUME's 1982-83 needs assessment (See Appendix B for a sample of an activity log page.)

Perception by School-Level Co-Participants (i.e. Principals) of Project Personnel Services

To ascertain the extent to which administrators favorably viewed the services of CUME's two educational specialists, a questionnaire (See Appendix C), developed by OEA was sent by school mail (in May, 1983) to the principals of all schools participating in the CUME Project.

Evaluation of CUME-Sponsored Workshops

To determine the extent to which consumers of CUME-sponsored workshops favorably evaluated the presentations facilitated by project staff, questionnaires (one for parents and the other for DCPS staff) (See Appendix D) developed by OEA, were administered to all CUME participants at the end of each workshop.

Participants' Actual Utilization and Perceived Effectiveness of Approaches to Problems Suggested during the Workshops

To ascertain the extent to which approaches to problems suggested in the presentations were actually applied and perceived as effective, a questionnaire (See Appendix E) developed by OEA, was sent via school mail (in May, 1983) to all CUME participants.

Results

The following section contains detailed findings of the evaluation of the CUME Project. Initially presented are the results of an appraisal of the project's activity logs. Next, information is presented to evaluate the quality and appropriateness of various CUME inservice presentations. Finally, data are displayed to ascertain the extent to which approaches to problems suggested during CUME-sponsored workshops were actually utilized and perceived as effective by CUME participants.

Appraisal of Project Activity Logs

Since the two CUME Educational Specialists who maintained logs (along with a project secretary) comprised the entire staff, activities which the specialists documented in their respective logs were assumed to provide a relatively complete description of all project activities. Most of the activities/events referred to in the logs may be incorporated into the following categories:

1. Establishing an/or maintaining the CUME Educational Specialists' contacts (via formal and informal meetings) with schools and administrators in the North Central Area;

2. Planning and formulating project activities based on the information gathered from last year's evaluation as well as upon data collected from the meetings mentioned in #1 above;

3. Reviewing proposals for inservice presentations submitted by CUME Project schools;

4. Organizing, scheduling, and monitoring CUME-sponsored inservice activities (including the procurement of resource persons to conduct the activities);

5. Visiting CUME Project schools;

6. Attending feeder pattern administrator meetings, making presentations at these meetings, and writing reports for submission to the TEC Director;

7. Participating in TEC staff meetings and preparing/revising the 1983-84 CUME budget;

8. Developing the CUME Project proposal for the 1984-85 school year.

The content analysis of the CUME activity logs (described above) was discussed with the two Educational Specialists, and the major activities were verified.

Perception by School-Level Co-Participants (i.e. principals) of Project Personnel's Services.

To determine the extent to which school administrators positively and/or negatively viewed the services of CUME's Educational Specialists, a questionnaire was sent via school mail at the end of May to all the principals of schools involved with the CUME Project. (See Appendix C for a copy of this form.) Questionnaires were mailed out on May 30, 1984 with a request that the administrators return the completed form by June 15. Despite "follow-up" phone calls by OEA staff, none of the questionnaires were returned. Consequently, no data regarding administrators' perceptions of CUME's impact on their respective schools will be offered.

Evaluation of CUME-Sponsored Workshops

Participants' Reactions to CUME-Sponsored Workshops

To obtain the workshop participants' attitudes toward the specific inservices they attended, a questionnaire was administered to each of the workshop attendees upon conclusion of the final session of each presentation.

Examination of CUME records indicated that project staff scheduled 19 workshops for teachers and three workshops for parents during the 1983-84 school year. (See Appendix F for a copy of this schedule.) It should be noted, however, that the first parent workshop (implemented in November, 1983 at Allapattah Elementary) was sparsely attended with only two or three parents

coming to each session. Consequently, it was ended prematurely. Furthermore, the third parent workshop, planned to begin on May 27, 1984 at Lorah Park Elementary, was cancelled and not rescheduled due to the lateness of the school year. In short, the CUME staff scheduled 22 workshops--20 were held, one ended prematurely, and one was cancelled and never rescheduled.

All participants of the "teacher-focused" workshops completed the same questionnaire on the last day of each of the various presentations. Analyses of the responses to this form indicated that 242 school personnel representing at least 17 elementary and three secondary schools in the North Central Area attended the workshops. Two-hundred and twenty-five of the participants worked in elementary schools and the remaining 17 were involved with secondary schools. The average attendance at each workshop was about ten individuals.

The teacher-oriented Likert-style questionnaire was designed to obtain the consumer's perceptions concerning various aspects of the workshop. Eleven statements on this questionnaire were utilized to gather these perceptions which included the participants' views concerning the quality of the resource person's presentation and the appropriateness of the information offered.

Concerning the workshop entitled "Teacher Effectiveness Training," two sessions at two different schools were held on this topic and they were both conducted by the same resource person. Forty-four teachers representing four elementary schools attended the workshop. Analysis of teacher responses to this questionnaire indicated that the overwhelming majority of participants thought the leader's presentation was acceptable in terms of clarity of presentation, remaining "on-task", appropriately blending theory and practice and providing adequate support material (See items #10 - #17) and the information offered was relevant to the workshop title and appropriate for their classrooms and respective teaching styles. Furthermore, over 95 percent planned to utilize at least some of the ideas which were discussed (See Table II for a complete breakdown of responses to the various statements.)

Regarding the workshop called "Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom," nine different sessions were conducted. Five were led by one instructor, two were conducted by a second leader, and another two were under the auspices of a third instructor. One hundred and thirteen individuals (93 of whom were teachers) representing seven elementary schools and one secondary school attended the workshop. Again, the vast majority of participants believed the leaders' presentations were acceptable and that the knowledge offered was relevant to the title and appropriate for their classrooms and teaching styles. In addition, once again, over 95 percent of the respondents stated that they would utilize at least some of the ideas which the resource persons supplied. (See Table III for a complete breakdown of responses to the various statements.)

A third workshop, "Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Multicultural Education" was held at one school and attended by eight elementary teachers working at that school. One hundred percent of the participants thought the workshop was well conducted, offered knowledge relevant to the title and to their classrooms and would employ at least some of the suggestions presented. (See Table IV)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Turner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Concerning the workshop called "Developing a Discipline Plan in an Urban Inner City School", 20 people (19 of whom were elementary teachers) representing four different elementary schools and one secondary school, attended this inservice. Once again, analysis of questionnaire responses corresponding to this workshop indicated that at least 90 percent of the attendees thought the workshop was well conducted, the information offered was relevant to the title and appropriate for their respective classrooms, and believed they would employ with their students at least some of the ideas presented. (See Table V)

The workshop entitled "Study Skills In-School" was attended by 28 teachers, representing two elementary schools. Analyses of these teachers' responses to the survey statements suggested that over 90 percent of these participants believed the leader adequately presented the material and offered knowledge which was relevant to the title and applicable to their classrooms. In addition, 100 percent of the attendees indicated they would employ at least some of the ideas they had learned during the workshop. (See Table VI)

The next workshop, which dealt with economics, had 12 participants, representing seven junior high schools and four senior high schools, in attendance. Statistical analysis of their replies to the questionnaire showed that between 72 and 100 percent (depending on the specific item) of the participants were pleased with the presentation and thought the information offered was relevant to the title and appropriate for their classrooms. Furthermore, only one of the respondents said he/she would not use in his/her classroom any of the ideas offered in the workshop, two were undecided and four stated they would definitely employ at least some of the ideas they had learned. (See Table VII)

The workshop called "Discipline in the Classroom" was attended by ten teachers representing one elementary school. Analysis of teacher responses showed that 90 to 100 percent of the attendees thought the resource person conducted the workshop with clarity, believed the knowledge offered was relevant to the title and appropriate for their respective classroom situations, and stated that they would definitely employ some of the ideas presented by the leader. (See Table VIII)

The final CUME-sponsored workshop for school personnel was called "Basic Water Safety Skills." It was attended by 12 employees representing three elementary schools and three secondary schools. Data analysis of attendee responses to the questionnaire showed that for all areas under consideration, over 90 percent of the participants expressed positive feelings.
(See Table IX)

The Parent Workshop was attended by about 60 people, only 29 of whom agreed to complete the parent questionnaire. (It should also be mentioned that none of the participants would provide either their name or address on a sign-in sheet located on a table near the entrance to the door.) These 29 parents represented about 52 children. Thirty-seven of the children go to elementary schools while the remaining are enrolled in secondary schools. Examination of parental responses to the questionnaire showed that over 95 percent of the attendees believed the leader efficiently and clearly conducted the workshop, offered information which was relevant to the workshop title and appropriate for them, and planned to use at least some of the ideas they learned at the session. (See Table X)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Workshop Participants' Actual Utilization of Approaches to Problems Offered during the Training Sessions and the Perceived Effectiveness of these Potential Solutions

To determine the extent to which the workshop participants actually implemented and perceived as effective at least some of the ideas presented in their respective sessions, a questionnaire was sent at the end of May, via school mail, to all 242 attendees of the CUME-sponsored workshops. Sixty-seven of these questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of approximately 28 percent. It should be mentioned, however, that only one questionnaire was returned for the workshop entitled "Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Multicultural Education, and one for the inservice called Economics. As a result of insufficient data, no comments will be made about these two workshops.

Twenty-four individuals returned questionnaires regarding the "Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom" workshop. Analysis of this data showed that over 96 percent of the respondents used at least two of the new skills they learned at the workshop, over 92 percent believed they would employ in their classrooms the majority of skills acquired at the workshop, and 84 percent thought the majority of new techniques which they tried were compatible with their respective teaching styles. (See Table XI)

Nineteen questionnaires were received concerning the inservice called "Teacher Effectiveness Training." An examination of responses to this questionnaire indicated that 100 percent of the respondents utilized at least two of the new skills they learned at the workshop, 83 percent found that they could employ most of the techniques presented, and at least 61 percent discovered that they could integrate into their teaching styles a majority of the new skills which were taught. (See Table XII)

Regarding the workshop entitled "Discipline and Classroom Management," ten attendees returned the questionnaire. Analysis of this data indicated that 80 percent of the respondents indicated that they had used at least two new skills; 70 percent thought they would use the majority of skills taught at the workshop, and found that the "new" skills were compatible with their teaching styles. (See Table XIII)

The workshop called "Study Skills In-School" generated the return of four questionnaires. One hundred percent of the respondents indicated that they had used at least two of the new skills acquired at the workshop and found they could utilize in their classrooms a majority of the new approaches learned at the inservice. Furthermore, 75 percent stated that the majority of new skills presented were compatible with their teaching styles. (See Table XIV)

Table II

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Teacher Effectiveness Training"

N=.	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important.	2	0	0	16	82
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives.	0	0	0	26	74
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	0	0	0	16	84
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	0	15	84
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	57	34	0	4	5
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	2	2	2	30	64
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	2	2	7	26	63
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	0	5	30	65
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	2	0	5	43	50
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	2	0	2	33	-
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	2	2	2	36	58
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leader(s) would be a good extension of the inservice.	0	22	14	32	32

Table III

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Motivation and Management in the Classroom"

N=113	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important.	4	1	0	25	70
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives.	5	1	2	32	60
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	4	0	0	29	67
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	4	0	1	33	62
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	29	51	5	12	3
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	4	2	7	51	36
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	3	5	7	55	30
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	3	3	7	44	43
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	3	0	13	42	42
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	3	0	2	52	43
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	2	2	13	48	35
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leader(s) would be a good extension of the inservice.	5	4	9	48	34

Table IV

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Multicultural Education"

N=8	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	0	0	0	0	100
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	0	0	0	0	100
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	0	0	0	0	100
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	0	14	86
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on applicaton.	75	25	0	0	0
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	0	12	88
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	0	0	0	100
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	0	25	75
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	0	0	0	12	88
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	0	0	0	12	88

Table V

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Developing a Discipline Plan in an Urban Inner City School"

N=20	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	5	0	0	5	90
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	0	0	0	20	80
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	0	5	0	30	65
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	5	20	75
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	50	25	5	5	15
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	5	0	10	35	50
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	0	40	60
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	5	5	45	45
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	5	45	50
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	5	0	30	65
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	0	5	0	40	55
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	5	0	0	30	65

Table VI

Participants' Perceptions Concerning the Workshop
"Study Skills In-School"

N=28	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	4	0	0	25	71
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	3	0	4	32	61
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	4	0	4	21	71
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	3	0	4	18	75
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	40	46	4	0	10
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	4	0	32	64
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	4	0	0	38	58
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	4	0	22	74
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	4	33	63
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	33	67
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	0	0	11	30	59
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	8	4	8	48	32

Table VII

Participants' Perceptions Concerning the Workshop "Economics"

N=7	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	0	0	43	57	0
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	0	0	0	57	43
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	0	0	0	33	67
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	0	57	43
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	29	43	0	0	28
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	14	43	43
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	17	33	50
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	0	14	43	43
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	0	57	43
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	14	29	43	14
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	0	0	0	71	29
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	0	29	0	42	29

Table VIII

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Discipline in the Classroom"

N=10	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	10	0	0	10	80
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	0	0	0	10	90
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	0	0	0	10	90
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	0	10	90
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	30	20	0	20	30
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	0	40	60
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	11	56	33
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	0	0	40	60
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	0	30	70
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	30	70
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	0	0	0	40	60
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	0	0	0	44	56

Table IX

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop
"Basic Water Safety Skills"

N=12	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop addressed a topic I believe is important	8	0	0	17	75
10.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	8	0	0	33	59
11.	The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.	8	0	0	33	59
12.	The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.	0	0	8	58	34
13.	The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.	17	83	0	0	0
14.	The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	8	0	0	50	42
15.	The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.	0	0	10	50	40
16.	Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered potential solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.	0	0	0	67	33
17.	I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop.	0	8	8	58	26
18.	While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall definitely employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.	0	18	27	55	0
19.	I believe I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.	8	0	17	50	25
20.	I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leaders would be a good extension of the inservice	0	10	10	70	10

Table X

Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Workshop Entitled "Parent Workshop"

N=29	Item	Percent responding to each choice: YES	NO
6.	The workshop leader(s) wasted time by talking about things other than parent training.	0	100
7.	The workshop focused on the stated objectives	100	0
8.	The workshop leader(s) spent too much time talking about parts of parent training which I believe will not work with my own child/children.	7	93
9.	The workshop leader(s) did not give me enough knowledge to put into practice all of the skills which he/she presented.	29	71
10.	The skills I learned at this workshop about being an effective parent are very different from the parenting techniques I usually use with my child/children.	61	39
11.	When dealing with my child/children. I shall definitely use at least some of the ideas I learned at this workshop.	96	4
12.	I think I shall be a more effective parent as a result of the knowledge I gained at this workshop.	96	4

Table XI

Participants' Actual Utilization and Perceived Effectiveness of Skills Acquired at the Workshops Entitled "Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom"

N=24	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop I attended addressed an important topic.	4	0	0	29	67
10.	During the 1983-84 school year, I used at least two of the new skills I learned at the workshop.	4	0	0	42	54
11.	I found that I could utilize in my classroom the majority of skills I acquired at the workshop.	4	4	0	50	42
12	After experimenting in my classroom with some of these new skills, I found that the majority of them were not compatible with my teaching style.	30	54	4	8	4
13.	The follow-up clinical supervision helped increase my understanding of at least some of the information presented at the workshop.	5	10	0	32	53
14.	The follow-up clinical supervision assisted me in maintaining the skills I learned at the workshop.	5	5	5	32	53
15.	The follow-up clinical supervision motivated me to use more of the skills I learned at the workshop.	5	5	0	42	48
16.	The follow-up clinical supervision was not a productive use of my time.	47	37	0	5	11

Table XII

Participants' Actual Utilization and Perceived Effectiveness of New Skills Acquired at the Workshop Entitled "Teacher Effectiveness Training"

N=19	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop I attended addressed an important topic.	0	0	0	28	72
10.	During the 1983-84 school year, I used at least two of the new skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	50	50
11.	I found that I could utilize in my classroom the majority of skills I acquired at the workshop.	0	6	11	50	33
12	After experimenting in my classroom with some of these new skills, I found that the majority of them were not compatible with my teaching style.	28	33	22	17	0
13.	The follow-up clinical supervision helped increase my understanding of at least some of the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
14.	The follow-up clinical supervision assisted me in maintaining the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
15.	The follow-up clinical supervision motivated me to use more of the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
16.	The follow-up clinical supervision was not a productive use of my time.	100	0	0	0	0

Table XIII

Participants' Actual Utilization and Perceived Effectiveness of Skills Acquired at the Workshop Called "Discipline and Classroom Management"

N=10	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop I attended addressed an important topic.	10	0	0	40	50
10.	During the 1983-84 school year, I used at least two of the new skills I learned at the workshop.	10	10	0	70	10
11.	I found that I could utilize in my classroom the majority of skills I acquired at the workshop.	10	20	0	40	30
12	After experimenting in my classroom with some of these new skills I found that the majority of them were not compatible with my teaching style.	10	60	10	20	0
13.	The follow-up clinical supervision helped increase my understanding of at least some of the information presented at the workshop.	20	0	0	60	20
14.	The follow-up clinical supervision assisted me in maintaining the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	75	25
15.	The follow-up clinical supervision motivated me to use more of the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	25	0	50	25
16.	The follow-up clinical supervision was not a productive use of my time.	67	33	0	0	0

Table XIV

Participants' Actual Utilization and Perceived Effectiveness of Skills Acquired at the Workshop Called "Study Skills In-School"

N=4	Item	Percent responding to each choice: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The workshop I attended addressed an important topic.	0	0	0	25	75
10.	During the 1983-84 school year, I used at least two of the new skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	25	75
11.	I found that I could utilize in my classroom the majority of skills I acquired at the workshop.	0	0	0	25	75
12	After experimenting in my classroom with some of these new skills, I found that the majority of them were not compatible with my teaching style.	50	25	0	0	25
13.	The follow-up clinical supervision helped increase my understanding of at least some of the information presented at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
14.	The follow-up clinical supervision assisted me in maintaining the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
15.	The follow-up clinical supervision motivated me to use more of the skills I learned at the workshop.	0	0	0	0	100
16.	The follow-up clinical supervision was not a productive use of my time.	100	0	0	0	0

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, the 1983-84 CUME Project remained in compliance with its amended proposal throughout the school year. More specifically, a review of the Educational Specialists' activity logs indicated that both spent between 75 and 95 percent of their time involved with activities designed to address problems defined during CUME's 1982-83 operation. Furthermore, analysis of responses to questionnaires showed that the workshops facilitated by the Project staff were well performed and appropriate given the nature of the problems addressed. Finally, an examination of replies to a questionnaire distributed near the end of the 1983-84 school year suggested that approaches to problems offered during the various workshops were actually applied and perceived as effective by a large majority of the respondents.

Notwithstanding the fact that 1983-84 CUME Project substantially addressed two of the major problems experienced by administrators, teachers, and parents involved with inner-city schools (i.e. a need for increased professional preparation and a need to develop school-based organizational structures), a lack of funding prevented it from fully dealing with two other major areas of concern to many inner city schools--namely, fragmentation in terms of communication, purpose, and resource support; and high teacher attrition. Thus, due to a limited role, it appears the CUME Project was unable to strongly impact inner-city school problems. In short, the relatively restricted efforts CUME employed to deal with inner-city school problems appeared to be substantially diluted due to the pervasive extent of difficulties encapsulated in most of the inner-city schools.

As a result of these findings, the following recommendation is made:

> CUME should be eliminated unless the project is sufficiently well supported to address other problems characteristic of inner-city schools, namely fragmentation and high teacher attrition. The efforts which CUME offered to develop inner-city school projects during the 1983-84 school year were certainly appropriate and relevant. The impact of these efforts within the participating schools, however, was probably minimal, compared to the vast range of problems which the inner-city schools are experiencing. An alternative to more fully supporting the project would include targeting two or three of Dade's inner-city schools and addressing most, if not all, of the major problems in these schools during the 1984-85 school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OEA: 08/28/84
CUME - Eval1/AWOJ

Appendix A

M E M O R A N D U M

September 30, 1983

TO: John Ranieri, Director
Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center

FROM: Bob Collins, Evaluation Specialist
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF THE 1983-84 CENTER FOR URBAN/MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME) PROJECT

This memorandum is in response to our meeting of September 7, 1983 and expresses my understanding of directions which CUME will take during 1983-84.

I understand that the funds which you originally requested, and which were assumed when the program proposal was developed were substantially reduced, requiring a corresponding reduction in the scope of the proposed project activities. Based on our meeting, I understand that such a reduced project will likely encompass:

1. the satisfaction of "carry-over" obligations from the previous year, including
   a. the conduct of Study Skills Workshops (Jackson Feeder Pattern) - dependent upon results of a poll of teachers to determine their interest in providing inservice instruction;
   b. the conduct of Parent Effectiveness Training (Allapattah);
   c. the conduct of Organizational Development Workshops (Westview and Madison).

2. the utilization of remaining funds for
   a. recently submitted North Central Area inservice proposals (approximately 11);
   b. new or extended proposals (as yet undefined).

It might be advisable to also consider the implementation of "cost free" (if there are such things) project activities, distinct from those which are a "normal" part of TEC operations. One idea might be to provide assistance in the implementation of school-based Citizens' Advisory Committees, as discussed in the original 1983-84 CUME program proposal.

Whichever way you decide to go on these and other matters, it would be a good idea to submit a revised program proposal to Bob McGee. Doing this would insure that we could evaluate the 1983-84 project "against" an up-to-date project description, rather than one which assumes the availability of a greater level of funding than you actually have at your disposal. I would be willing to work with you and your staff in the preparation of such a revised document.

Please contact me when you have finalized the design of your 1983-84 project and we can initiate the design of this year's evaluation.

In reference to another matter, I have condensed Marlene Mitchell's report and will provide a draft for your review as soon as it becomes available.

I look forward to working with you again this year.

BC:nmi

DADE-MONROE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER
BUREAU OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION

MEMORANDUM

February 14, 1984

TO: Mr. Bob McGee, Coordinator
Office of Federal Projects Administration

FROM: John M. Ranieri, Director
Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center

SUBJECT: CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION AMENDMENT

The approved proposal for the Center for Urban and Minority Education Project states in its rationale the focus on efficient and effective use of human and material resources to be used in a collaborative structure of joint problem solving to promote positive school climate in urban inner city schools. The program intent of the Center for Urban and Minority Education remains unchanged.

The purpose of this amendment is to request the deletion of the establishment of an Advisory Council to the Project and the establishment of the parent/community network as stated in proposed solutions and rationale.

Additionally, the collaboration with the North Central Area's administrative staff, the Intergroup Relations Team and the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center in the proposed New Teacher Immersion Program designed to impact and address teacher attrition in the inner city schools did not materialize; therefore, the intended collaboration can not be established.

JMR:oh

cc: Dr. J. L. DeChurch
Mr. N. Proller

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CUME - SPECIALIST

ACTIVITY LOG

1. NAME AND ROLE OF PERSON REQUESTING PERFORMANCE				2. DATE(S) TIME OF ACTIVITY		3. PROBLEM ADDRESSED AND DESCRIPTION OF ACTION				INDIVIDUALS SERVED		
DATE	NAME	ROLE	FORM OF REQUEST*	DATE	APPROX. TIME	PROBLEM STATEMENT	A	B	ACTION	NAME ADDRESS	PERSON CATEGORY	LOC #

* e. g., phone call, note
** e. g., teachers, administrators, parents, etc.

A Identified by initial project needs assessment (Place ____ if identified)
B Related to adoption of Teacher Corps information/materials (place ____ if related)

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-1254
May 30, 1984

TO: Principals of Schools Involved with the Center for Urban and Minority Education (CUME) Project

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent RT (RW)
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: THE EVALUATION OF CUME'S INSERVICE ACTIVITIES

As part of our evaluation of the Center for Urban and Minority Education, we are requesting that principals of schools served by this project provide us with some indication of its impact by responding to the attached survey.

We are interested in learning, among other things, your perceptions regarding the usefulness of the services provided by the CUME Project staff and the impact of the inservice activities upon your school.

Please complete the attached questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope before June 15th, 1984. Responses to this survey will be combined with those of other principals to depict a general picture of the CUME Project. In no case will individual principal's responses be published.

Furthermore, please note that we are also surveying all teachers in your school who attended a CUME workshop during the 1983-84 school year to determine their perceptions regarding the utility of any skills they might have acquired as a result of attendance at the workshop. A copy of this teacher questionnaire is included for your information.

If you have any questions regarding the nature of this request, please feel free to call me or Norm Proller at 350-3447.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

RT:NP:rvw

Attachments

cc: Mr. Horace Martin
Selected Area Directors
Mr. John Ranieri
Dr. Bob Collins
Dr. Norm Proller
Ms. Rosa Harvey
Ms. Ellen Williams

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

1. SCHOOL LEVEL OF CURRENT JOB ASSIGNMENT:

____1 Elementary School ____2 Middle/Junior High School ____3 Senior High School

1 - 3

2. TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN CURRENT SCHOOL:

____1 0 - 11 months ____2 1 - 3 years ____3 4 - 6 years ____4 7 - 9 years

____5 more than 9 years

3. TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE WORKING AS A PRINCIPAL:

____1 0 - 11 months ____2 1 - 3 years ____3 4 - 6 years ____4 7 - 9 years

____5 more than 9 years

INSTRUCTIONS: BEFORE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE PUT THE NUMBER UNDERLYING THE RESPONSE WHICH MOST CLOSELY REFLECTS YOUR OPINION. AFTER COMPLETING THE SURVEY, PLACE THIS FORM IN THE ATTACHED, PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE AND RETURN IT VIA SCHOOL MAIL. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1	DISAGREE 2	UNDECIDED 3	AGREE 4	STRONGLY AGREE 5

____ A. The CUME staff provided the inservice which was requested and/or an appropriate alternative. 4

____ B. The CUME personnel served effectively as liaison for the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC). 5

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1984

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1	DISAGREE 2	UNDECIDED 3	AGREE 4	STRONGLY AGREE 5

____ C.	The CUME staff assisted me in considering approaches which might enhance my school's relationship with parents.	6
____ D.	The CUME staff aided me in implementing activities which might strengthen my school's relationship with parents.	7
____ E.	The CUME Project inservice activity helped the participating school personnel work more effectively with their respective students	8
____ F.	My school's TEC Representative served effectively as a liaison between the school and the CUME Project's staff.	9
____ G.	As a result of my school's participation in the CUME Project, curricula and/or other academic programs have been revised/ initiated in my school.	10
____ H.	The CUME staff satisfactorily oriented me to the objectives of their project.	11
____ I.	Overall, I would say that participation in the CUME Project has improved communications/cooperation among the personnel in my school.	12
____ J.	The CUME Project provided inservice activities appropriately related to the development of increased parental involvement in my school.	13
____ K.	Overall, I would say that participation in the CUME Project has improved communications/cooperation among the personnel in my school.	14
____ L.	Overall, I would say that participation in the CUME Project has improved communications/cooperation between my school, the parents and the community.	15
____ M.	Overall, I believe that the school, the parents, and the community have a better relationship as a result of my school's participation in the CUME Project.	16

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1984

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Please provide any comments you would care to make regarding your school's participation in the CUME Project:

(PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE, IF NECESSARY, TO WRITE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.)

OEA: 5/25/84
CUME/SURVEY - RW/SURVEY

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1984

Appendix D

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1410 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
MR. PAUL L. CEJAS, CHAIRMAN
MR. ROBERT RENICK, VICE-CHAIRMAN
MRS. ETHEL BECKHAM
MR. G. HOLMES BRADDOCK
DR. MICHAEL KROP
MS. JANET R. McALILEY
MR. WILLIAM H. TURNER

May 15, 1984

Dear CUME Workshop Participant:

As part of an evaluation of the 1983-84 CUME Project, the Office of Educational Accountability, in collaboration with the Teacher Education Center, is conducting this survey to obtain information descriptive of the participants and their attitudes toward the specific presentation they have just experienced.

We appreciate your cooperation in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Norman L. Proller

Norman L. Proller
Evaluation Specialist

NP:sh

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
Center for Urban and Minority Education (CUME)
Inservice Evaluation

Do not write in this space

1-3

1. Workshop/Activity Title: _____

2. Date of Workshop/Activity: _____ 4-6

3. Name(s) of Resource Person(s): _____

4. School of Current Job Assignment (check one):

___ 0	Not applicable	___ 7	Phyllis Wheatley Elementary	
___ 1	Allapattah Elementary	___ 8	South Hialeah Elementary	7
___ 2	Comstock Elementary	___ 9	Allapattah Junior High	
___ 3	Holmes Elementary	___ 10	Robert E. Lee Junior	
___ 4	Kelsey Pharr Elementary	___ 11	Miami Jackson Senior High	
___ 5	Lakeview Elementary	___ 12	Other (please specify):	
___ 6	Miramar Elementary		_____	

5. Current Job Assignment within School (check one):

___ 0	Teacher	___ 3	School Administrator	
___ 1	Department Chairperson	___ 4	Parent Volunteer	8
___ 2	Student Services Personnel	___ 5	Other (please specify): _____	
			_____	

Do not write in this space

6. Elementary School Level Assignment (check one):

___ 0 Not Applicable
___ 1 K-3
___ 2 4-6 9
___ 3 Other (please specify):_____

_____

7. Secondary School Level Main Job Assignment (check one):

___ 0 Not Applicable
___ 1 Language Arts
___ 2 Mathematics
___ 3 Social Studies
___ 4 Science
___ 5 Foreign Language
___ 6 ESL
___ 7 Physical Education
___ 8 Student Services Personnel 10
___ 9 Voc./Tech. Education
___ 10 Enrichment
___ 11 Other (Please specify):_____
_____
_____

8. Total Years of Experience in Current School (check one):

___ 0 0 - 11 months
___ 1 1 - 3 years
___ 2 4 - 6 years 11
___ 3 7 - 10 years
___ 4 10 + years

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER UNDERLYING THE WORD(S) WHICH MOST ACCURATELY DESCRIBE(S) YOUR BELIEF.

Do not write in this space

9. The workshop addressed a topic which I believe is important.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	12

10. The workshop focused on the stated objectives.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	13

11. The resource person(s) presented the material clearly.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	14

12. The resource person(s) remained on task throughout the presentation.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	15

13. The resource person(s) placed too much emphasis on theory and insufficient emphasis on application.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	16

14. The resource person(s) offered enough information for me to implement the ideas presented.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1	2	3	4	5	17

Do not Write in this space

15. The resource person(s) provided sufficient support materials for me to utilize the concepts offered in the workshop.

NOT APPLICABLE
0

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 — 18

16. Concerning the topic discussed in the workshop, I believe the resource person(s) offered practical solutions which I can utilize in my working situation.

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 — 19

17. I can easily integrate into my teaching/working style the information presented at the workshop. — 20

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5

18. While teaching/working during the remainder of the school year, I shall <u>definitely</u> employ at least some of the ideas I learned at the workshop.

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 — 21

19. I think I shall be more effective in my duties as a result of knowledge I obtained at the workshop.

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 — 22

20. I believe that a follow-up observation combined with feedback by the workshop leader(s) would be a good extension of the in-service. — 23

NOT APPLICABLE
0

Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Undecided 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1410 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
MR. PAUL L. CEJAS, CHAIRMAN
MR. ROBERT RENICK, VICE-CHAIRMAN
MRS. ETHEL BECKHAM
MR. G. HOLMES BRADDOCK
DR. MICHAEL KROP
MS. JANET R. McALILEY
MR. WILLIAM H. TURNER

May 31, 1984

Dear CUME Workshop Participant:

As part of an evaluation of the 1983-84 CUME Project, the Office of Educational Accountability, in collaboration with the Teacher Education Center, is conducting this survey to obtain information descriptive of the participants and their attitudes toward the specific presentation they have just experienced.

We appreciate your cooperation in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Norman L. Proller

Norman L. Proller
Evaluation Specialist

NP:sh

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN/MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME) PROJECT

PARENT SURVEY

Do Not Write in This Space
1 - 3

INSTRUCTIONS: The CUME Project and the Office of Educational Accountability are evaluating the quality of CUME's parent training workshops. In addition, we are also attempting to gather information which will allow us to best plan future activities involving parents and schools. To help us accomplish these tasks, we request that you respond to the following statements and then place the completed survey in the attached envelope and give it to the instructor. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. Title of workshop: _____

2. Date of workshop: _____ 4 - 6

3. Workshop leader's name(s): _____

4. State the number of children you have in:

___ Elementary School ___ Junior High School ___ Senior High School 7 - 9

5. I work outside my place of residence at a:

____ Full-time Job ____ Part-time Job ____ Does not apply 10

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY PLACING A CHECK MARK (X) IN EITHER THE "YES" OR THE "NO" BOX.

6. The workshop leader(s) wasted time by talking about things other than parent training. 11

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do Not Write In This Space

Parent Survey
(continued)

7. The workshop leader(s) presented the information clearly. 12

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. The workshop leader(s) spent too much time talking about parts of parent training which I believe will not work with my own child/ children. 13

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. The workshop leader(s) did not give me enough knowledge to put into practice all of the skills which he/she presented. 14

☐ Yes ☐ No

10. The skills I learned at this workshop about being an effective parent are very different from the parenting techniques I usually use with my child/children. 15

☐ Yes ☐ No

11. When dealing with my child/children, I shall definitely use at least some of the ideas I learned at this workshop. 16

☐ Yes ☐ No

12. I think I shall be a more effective parent as a result of the knowledge I gained at this workshop. 17

☐ Yes ☐ No

Appendix E

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

MEMORANDUM

RT - 1396
June 7, 1984

TO: Principals of Schools Involved with the Center for Urban/Minority Education (CUME) Project

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF INSERVICE EVALUATIONS TO TEACHERS WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN CUME WORKSHOPS

As part of an evaluation of the 1983-84 ECIA, Chapter II CUME Project, we are asking teachers who have participated in CUME workshops to react to the utility of the information provided in these inservices.

Please distribute one of the enclosed surveys and one return envelope to each of your teachers included on the list which is on top of the accompanying package. Teachers have been asked to return completed surveys to us via school mail, by June 15.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

RT:BC:rvw

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace Martin
Mr. John Ranieri
Dr. Bob Collins

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-1350
May 30, 1984

TO: All Teachers Who Participated in the 1983-84 School Year Workshops Sponsored by the Center for Urban/Minority Education (CUME)

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: SURVEY TO DETERMINE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF CUME WORKSHOPS

As part of an evaluation of the 1983-84 CUME Project, the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting a survey to obtain information descriptive of the participants and their beliefs concerning the effectiveness of new skills they may have acquired as a result of attending a CUME sponsored inservice. To help us accomplish this task, we request that you respond to each of the statements on the attached survey. Upon completion of this survey, place the form in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope, and return it via school mail no later than June 15th. Note that we are not requesting your name, so as to protect the confidentiality of your responses.

Should you have questions about this evaluation or about the survey specifically, please do not hesitate to call me or Norm Proller at 350-3447.

We appreciate your cooperation in this endeavor.

RT/NP/awoj

Attachments

cc: Mr. Horace Martin
Selected Area Directors
Mr. John Ranieri
Dr. Bob Collins
Ms. Ellen Williams
Ms. Rosa Harvey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
INSERVICE EVALUATION

DO NOT WRIT IN THIS SPAC

1-3

1. Workshop/Activity Title: _____

2. Date of Workshop/Activity: _____ 4-6

3. Name(s) of Resource Person(s): _____

_____

4. School of Current Job Assignment (check one):

___0	Not Applicable	___7	Phyllis Wheatley Elementary
___1	Allapattah Elementary	___8	South Hialeah Elementary 7
___2	Comstock Elementary	___9	Allapattah Junior High
___3	Holmes Elementary	___10	Robert E. Lee Junior
___4	Kelsey Pharr Elementary	___11	Miami Jackson Senior High
___5	Lakeview Elementary	___12	Other (please specify):
___6	Miramar Elementary		_____

5. Current Job Assignment within School (check one):

___0	Teacher	___3	School Administrator
___1	Department Chairperson	___4	Parent Volunteer 8
___2	Student Services Personnel	___5	Other (please specify):
			_____
			_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1984

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
INSERVICE EVALUATION

DO NOT WRIT IN THIS SPAC

6. Elementary School Level Assignment (check one):

___ 0 Not Applicable
___ 1 K-3
___ 2 4-6
___ 3 Other (please specify):_____

_____

9

7. Secondary School Level Main Job Assignment (check one):

___ 0 Not Applicable
___ 1 Language Arts
___ 2 Mathematics
___ 3 Social Studies
___ 4 Science
___ 5 Foreign Language
___ 6 ESL
___ 7 Physical Education
___ 8 Student Services Personnel
___ 9 Voc./Tech. Education
___ 10 Enrichment
___ 11 Other (Please specify):_____

_____

_____

10

8. Total Years of Experience in Current School (check one):

___ 0 0 - 11 months
___ 1 1 - 3 years
___ 2 4 - 6 years
___ 3 7 - 10 years
___ 4 10 + years

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1989

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
INSERVICE EVALUATION

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER UNDERLYING THE WORD(S) WHICH MOST ACCURATELY DESCRIBE(S) YOUR BELIEF.

9. The workshop I attended addressed an important topic. 12

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

10. During the 83-84 school year, I used at least two of the new skills I learned at the workshop. 13

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

11. I found that I could utilize in my classroom the majority of skills I acquired at the workshop. 14

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

12. After experimenting in my classroom with some of these new skills, I found that the majority of them were not compatible with my teaching style. 15

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

* * * *

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION (CUME)
INSERVICE EVALUATION

DO NOT WRI
IN THIS SPA

14. The follow-up clinical supervision assisted me in maintaining the skills I learned at the workshop. 17

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

15. The follow-up clinical supervision motivated me to use more of the skills I learned at the workshop. 18

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

16. The follow-up clinical supervision was not a productive use of my time. 19

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OEA: 3/8/84
CUME - SURVEY/RW

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1984

Appendix F

INSERVICE CALENDAR

WORKSHOP/SITE	DATES/TIME	DAY(S) SESSIONS	PARTICIPANTS	INSTRUCTOR
Parent Effectiveness Training **Allapattah Elem.**	11/01/83-12/15/83 6:00 pm - 9:00 pm	T, Th 8	24 Parents	Reichbach
Study Skills Follow-up **Miami Jackson Sr. High Feeder Pattern**	11/11/83 8:30 am - 3:30 pm	F 1	17 Teachers	Singh/Davis
Teacher Effectiveness Training **Nathan B. Young Elem.**	12/01/83 - 02/29/84 1:50 pm - 4:50 pm	10	18 Teachers	Reichbach
Teacher Effectiveness Training **Comstock Elem.**	01/27/83 - 04/16/84 1:50 pm - 4:50 pm	10	30 Teachers	Reichbach
Professional Workshop: Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom **Lakeview Elem.**	02/03/84 02/10/84 8:30 am - 4:50 pm	F 2	20 Teachers	Reichbach
Professional Workshop: Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom **South Hialeah Elem.**	02/24/84 02/27/84 8:30 am - 3:00 pm	F 2	20 Teachers	Reichbach
Study Skills In-school **Comstock Elem.**	03/14/84-04/18/84 2:00 pm - 3:00 pm	W 4	12 Teachers	Mendel
Professional Workshop: Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom **Lillie C. Evans Elem.**	03/01/84 4/18/84- 8:30 am - 3:00 pm	T, W 2	20 Teachers	Toomer
Professional Workshop: Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom **Poinciana Park Elem.**	03/15/84 03/19/84 8:30 am - 3:00 pm	M, Th 2	20 Teachers	Wagner
Professional Workshop: ment in the Elementary Classroom **Allapattah Elem.**	03/20/84 03/21/84 8:30 am - 3:00 pm	T, W 2	20 Teachers	Toomer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

continued...

Professional Workshop: Motivation and Management in the Elementary Classroom Holmes Elem.	03/23/84 03/30/84 8:30 am - 3:00 pm	F 2	20 Teachers	Reichbach
Study Skills In-school Allapattah Elem.	04/20/84 8:00 am - 12:00 pm	F 1	17 Teachers	McBride/ Hart
Improving Your Total Test Performance Miami Springs Sr.	04/13/84 05/18/84 8:00 am - 3:00 pm	2	12 Dept. Chairs. 6 Counselors 6 Asst. Prin.	Burt
Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Multicultural Ed. Santa Clara Elem.	04/10/84 04/12/84 04/18/84 8:00 am - 3:00 pm 2:00 am - 5:00 pm	3	11 Teachers	Intergroup Relations Team
Professional Workshop Developing a Discipline Plan in an Urban Inner City School Earlington Heights Elem. Flamingo Elem. Olinda Elem. Orchard Villa Elem. Shadowlawn Elem.	4/10/84	1	20 Teachers	Forger
Parent Workshop Lakeview Elem.	05/15/84 7:30 pm	T 1	Parents	
Parent Workshop Lorah Park Elem.	05/27/84	1	Parents	
Economics Workshop Allapattah Junior High	05/14/84 11:30 pm - 3:30 pm	M I	10 Teachers	Abbe Jean Kehler
Classroom Discipline Allapattah Elementary	05/17/84 8:00 am - 3:00 pm	TH I	20 Teachers	Parley
Basic Water Safety Skills Miami-Dade South	05/3/84 8:00 am - 3:00 pm	TH I	12 Teachers	Hahn

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93-508 (Federal and Florida State Law, Chapter 77-422, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.